

#10/c Ho
Vbq nwn
7/23/03

PATENT
IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: July 18, 2003
Serial No.: 10/061,638
Filing Date: January 31, 2002
Applicant: JEVONS, et al.
Title: THREE DIMENSIONAL SQUARE TOOL
Examiner: Amy R. Cohen
Art Unit: 2859
Telephone: (703) 305-4972
Facsimile: (703) 746-9161

Ok to
enter
AF
7/22

Mail Stop AF
Hon. Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks
Washington, D. C. 20231

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION VIA FACSIMILE

FAX NUMBER (703) 746-9161

I hereby certify that this correspondence is addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, and is being transmitted via facsimile this 18th day of July, 2003.

[Signature]

Sir:

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION
PURSUANT TO 37 CFR 1.116(a)**

This Paper responds to the communication from the Examiner mailed April 25, 2003, and the telephone interview between Applicant and the Examiner conducted on July 16, 2003. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview, and as discussed in the interview, hereby requests reconsideration of the Examiner's prior art claim rejections. Additionally, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the

FAX RECEIVED
JUL 18 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

WA 712663-1

Serial N . 10/061,638

Inventor: JEVONS, et al.

Page 2

Examiner's objections to the drawings and specification, as well as the Examiner's claim rejections made pursuant to 35 USC § 112.

Please enter the following amendment to the above-identified application.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

ISSUES RAISED IN THE OFFICE ACTION

In the Office Action the Examiner indicated that Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Torezon; Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Torezon in view of Boelling (U.S. Patent No. 5,855,073); Claims 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Torezon in view of Thiel; Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as containing new matter; and Claims 8-11 were rejected as being indefinite. The Examiner has objected to Claim 1, lines 4-5 as requiring proper antecedent basis. In addition, the Examiner has objected to the drawings and the specification as containing new matter that was not supported by the original disclosure.

The applicant offers the following proposed amendment and remarks in response and by which, the applicant believes, allowable subject matter is achieved.

WA 712663-1